

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

WTA

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,006	01/20/2004	Toshinori Nagahashi	118385	6839

25944 7590 03/14/2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

LIU, JONATHAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2663

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/759,006	Applicant(s) NAGAHASHI ET AL.	
	Examiner Jonathan Liou	Art Unit 2663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/01/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1-3 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onoda U.S. Pat. 6,169,544 B1, in view of Imaizumi et al U.S. Pat. 5,430,832.

4. In regards to claim 1 and 5-6, Onoda teaches a noticing area calculating section, a template selecting section, and an image processing section for enlarging, contracting, and rotating. He also provides the method of how to perform those sections (col 4-6 Onoda.) Although Onoda teaches the editing and trimming, he has not explicitly described the designating sections and methods of a trimming rule and trimming shape recited in the claim 1 and 5. However, Imaizumi teaches that a

trimming function and trimming frame, which perform the same functionalities as a trimming rule and trimming shape recited in the claim 1 and 5.

Onoda teaches a frame designation portion (4 FIG.1 Onoda) for assigning an image into the layout area for layout compensation operations, which performs a trimming operation (col 4, lines 4-37 Onoda.); hence, the frame designation in the reference of Onoda performs the same function as a noticing area calculating section. Onoda also teaches a template selection portion for selecting a designated template from a plurality of template groups, which stores in the external memory device (col 4, lines 1-4 Onoda.) Hence, a template selecting portion performs the same functions as a template selecting section recited in the claim 1 and 5. He also teaches that a frame layout have a error calculating section for calculating the aspect ratio information of a image in the frame portion in the layout area or the template (FIG. 2, col 4, lines 46-67, and col 5, lines 1-60 Onoda.) Further, Onoda's image editing device also provide a processing section for an image, and the processing section includes enlarging, contracting, and rotating the image, the panorama-size image scope, which is equivalent to the trimming scope, and the template; then, those functionalities adjust the distribution ratio of the layout area in the template to the method for trimming (col 4-6 Onoda.)

Imaizumi et al. teaches the state of trimming in an image editing apparatus having the function of trimming for trimming an image (col 3, lines 9-51 Imaizumi et al.), and the trimming frame corresponds to the size of the original image and the scope of trimming could be easily changed, improving convenience in use (col 3, lines 24-61,

Imaizumi et al.) The state of trimming and the trimming frame in the reference Imaizumi et al. perform the same functionalities as trimming rule and trimming shape recited in the claim 1 and 5. In addition, Imaizumi et al. discloses that the function of trimming an arbitrary area out of an image displayed on a screen (See col 3, lines 26-28, Imaizumi et al.) Imaizumi et al. also teach the user can select this arbitrary by setting modes (See Fig. 5 and col 6, lines 32-40, Imaizumi et al.) Although Fig. 12(a) to 14 (f) of Imaizumi only disclose rectangular trimming frames, the figures are only an example regarding to the scope of invention. Imaizumi et al. also teach a program ROM 202 storing control program for executing the program (See col 7, lines 35-50, Imaizumi et al.)

Further, Imaizumi et al. teaches that his present invention is to improve convenience in use of an image editing apparatus having the function of trimming (col3, lines 12-14 Imagism et al.) Since Imaizumi et al. suggests that his invention could improve the image edit device having the trimming device, Onoda's device could have the same improvement by Imaizumi et al.'s teaching. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Onoda's image edit device over Imaizumi et al.'s teaching because the improvement of Imaizumi et al. would provide more flexibility for trimming the image on the Onoda's image editing device. Moreover, the reference of Onoda does teach the editing function and trimming functions (col 4-6 Onoda.)

5. In regards to claim 2-3, Imaizumi et al. further teaches that the trimming image is positioned at the center of the sheet, and the trimming area is automatically changed

Art Unit: 2663

with the sheet (col 11, 12 Imaizumi et al.) Hence, an image editing device of Onoda in view of Imaizumi et al. also provide the feature of aligning a center of the layout area and center of the template, and that performs the same functions as claim 2 recited. Further, Imaizumi et al. teaches the trimming image is positioned at the center of the sheet, which is rectangle shape, and the layout area and template for the image are inside of the area of the sheet. It is well known by crossing point of diagonal lines of a rectangle to find a center point of the object that surrounds by a rectangle, such as a sheet. Following the same rationale, basis, and motivation as applied to claim 1 in the office action, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a center aligning section and method of finding the center point on the image edit device of Onoda in view of Imaizumi et al.'s improvement because the aligning center of Imaizumi et al.'s can keep the balance of enlarging, contracting, and rotating in Onoda's device (col 11 Imaizumi et al.)

6. Claims 4, and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onoda U.S. Pat. 6,169,544 B1, in view of Imaizumi et al. U.S. Pat. 5,430,832 as applied to claim 1-3 above, and further in view of Tanaka JP A 2001-126070.

7. The image edit device of Onoda in view of Imaizumi et al.'s teaching provides the limitations in the recited claimed 1-3. Their device lacks the feature of a noticing area threshold section recited in the claim 4 and 7-8. Nevertheless, Tanaka teaches determining the degree of attractions by using automatic composition decision equipment, which could determine the good composition of balance on the image automatically by comparing a subject image with the reference. Those attraction of the

Art Unit: 2663

information on the image is lower than reference are cutoff from the image (see Tanaka reference.) Hence, the decision equipment of Tanaka provides the same functions as a noticing area threshold section recited in the claim 4 and 7-8. Although Onoda and Imaizumi et al does not talk about the threshold section, Onoda teaches a layout imbalance detection portion (col 4 Onoda), which has to have prior reference stored as the threshold mentions in the claim 4 and 7-8 in order to detect imbalance of the layout section. However, Tanaka gave the better representation of determining a reference for finding the attractive area. Since the device of Onoda in view of Imaizumi et al. and Tanaka's teaching teaches all of the limitations recited in the claim 4 and 7-8, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to improved the device of Onoda in view of Imaizumi et al. with Tanaka's teaching because determining a threshold with reference for the layout area is essential for the Image trimming device and Onoda does explicitly talks about a layout imbalance detection portion, which also need a reference to determine if a layout is imbalance (col 4 Onoda.)

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 03/01/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding to remarks address page 7, Applicant argues, "the cited references do not disclose that 'a user can designate the trimming range in any desirable shape' Examiner respectfully disagree because Imaizumi et al. discloses that the function of trimming an arbitrary area out of an image displayed on a screen (See col 3, lines 26-

28, Imaizumi et al.) Imaizumi et al. also teach the user can select this arbitrary by setting modes (See Fig. 5 and col 6, lines 32-40, Imaizumi et al.) Although Fig. 12(a) to 14 (f) of Imaizumi only disclose rectangular trimming frames, the figures are merely one example of the scope of invention. Thus, examiner believes the present amended claim invention of applicant has been taught by the cited reference.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Liou whose telephone number is 571-272-8136. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 5:00PM Mon-Fri.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on 571-272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jonathan Liou

3/8/2006


RICKY Q. NGO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Form PTO-1449 (REV. 1/06)		US Dept. of Commerce PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE		ATTY DOCKET NO. 118385		APPLICATION NO. 10/759,006	
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT (Use several sheets if necessary)				APPLICANT(S) Toshinori NAGAHASHI et al.			
<div style="text-align: center;">  </div>							
				FILING DATE January 20, 2004			

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS				
Examiner Initials	Cite No.	Document Number	Date	Name
SL	1	2002/0030634 A1	03/14/2002	Noda et al.

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS						
Examiner Initials	Cite No.	Document Number	Date	Country	With English Abstract	With English Translation

OTHER DOCUMENTS		
Examiner Initials	Cite No.	(Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, etc.)

EXAMINER <i>Forrest L.</i>	DATE CONSIDERED 3/8/06
----------------------------	---------------------------


Examiner: Initial if citation considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with M.P.E.P. 609; draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

Date: March 1, 2006

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
IF UNDELIVERABLE RETURN IN TEN DAYS

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER



BEST AVAILABLE COPY

